

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/613,152	07/03/2003	John G. Freshwater	18693.18	6735
27683 7:	590 02/08/2006		EXAMINER	
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP			GOODMAN, CHARLES	
DALLAS, TX	REET, SUITE 3100 75202		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			3724	
			DATE MAILED: 02/08/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
		10/613,152	FRESHWATER ET AL.		
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
		Charles Goodman	3724		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address		
WHIC - Exte afte: - If NO - Failt Any	HORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE on the may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 or SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDON	DN. timely filed  m the mailing date of this communication. IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 Ja	anuary 2006.			
2a)[	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This	action is non-final.			
3)[	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	I53 O.G. 213.		
Disposit	ion of Claims				
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1,5-13 and 31 is/are pending in the ap 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1,5-13 and 31 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.			
Applicat	ion Papers				
9) <u> </u>	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceedance acceedance and acceeda	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. So ion is required if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents  2. Certified copies of the priority documents  3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau  See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applica rity documents have been received in Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No ved in this National Stage		
Attachmer		[			
2)	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	• •		

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The Amendment filed on 1/9/2006 has been entered.

### Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/9/2006 has been entered.

## **Election/Restrictions**

3. Claims 27-30 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected Group II, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 1/26/05. Note last Office Action.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 10/613,152

Art Unit: 3724

- 5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 6. Claims 1, 5-13 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over King et al (US 6,220,329) in view of Simpson et al (US 5,641,551).

King et al discloses the invention substantially as claimed except that King et al is silent on the claimed four different patterns, i.e. cutting blades 2-5. However, Simpson et al teaches an apparatus method for cutting webs wherein multiple patterns may be cut out by a cutting assembly. Note Fig. 2. This also includes cutting transversely. Simpson et al's teachings suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art that multiple pattern cutting is desirable for more efficient run of orders during the operation of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time of the instant invention to provide the invention of King et al with the multiple pattern adaptability, e.g. the claimed four additional patterns as taught and suggested by Simpson et al in order to facilitate fulfillment of multiple orders of different patterns.

Regarding claim 5, although modified invention of King et al is not explicit on the specific pattern, i.e. dragon tooth, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time of the instant invention to provide the modified invention of King et al with the

Application/Control Number: 10/613,152

Art Unit: 3724

dragon tooth shape in order to facilitate production of one of various well known shingle designs, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the shape of a component. A change in shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art, especially since such a change does not render unexpected or unobvious results. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

### Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 1/9/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to Applicant's basic argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references essentially because the references do not have five cutting blades, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art.

See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the suggestion to combine stem from both references. King et al's invention effect substantially the same function of cutting shingles and multiple patterns albeit in serial form. However as noted in the rejection supra, Simpson et al's teachings suggest the desirability of having multipattern cut functionality in a reduced pass facilitated by eliminating multiple cutting cylinders.

Art Unit: 3724

#### **Conclusion**

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles Goodman whose telephone number is (571) 272-4508. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday between 7:30 AM to 6:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan Shoap, can be reached on (571) 272-4514. In lieu of mailing, it is encouraged that all formal responses be faxed to (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <a href="http://pair-direct.uspto.gov">http://pair-direct.uspto.gov</a>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at (866) 217-9197 (toll-free).

Charles Goodman Primary Examiner

**AU 3724** 

February 6, 2006

ARLES GO